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ABSTRACT/RESUME

Cette étude est la continuité et l'élargissement de mes recherches à long-terme sur l'histoire des femmes canadiennes au cours de la Deuxième Guerre Mondiale et au cours de la période d'après-guerre. J'examine ici certains aspects du Corps féminin de l'Armée canadienne de 1941 à 1946.

Les femmes n'ont servi qu'à titre d'infirmières au sein de l'Armée canadienne avant la Deuxième Guerre. L'admission des femmes dans les trois Forces armées pendant la Deuxième Guerre Mondiale a été un nouveau départ. Laissant de côté les histoires accessoires du Service féminin de la Marine royale du Canada et de la Division du personnel féminin de l'Aviation royale du Canada, cette étude se concentrera sur le Corps féminin de l'Armée canadienne. Tout comme la Marine et l'Aviation, l'Armée était l'institution masculine par excellence. La seule entrée des femmes dans ses rangs défait les conventions fondées sur la nature des femmes et leur place dans la société. Le manque de main d'œuvre força l'Armée à prendre la décision d'y admettre des femmes. Ce n'était qu'à titre expérimental.

Bien que formé en 1941, le Corps féminin de l'Armée canadienne n'a pas fait partie officiellement des Forces armées avant le mois de mars 1942. Au-delà de l'admission des femmes au statut militaire, l'Armée ne s'est pas aventurée très loin dans la contestation de la division sexuelle du travail et de l'autorité ou des archétypes concernant l'homme et la femme à l'œuvre dans la société civile canadienne. En
fait, non seulement les valeurs de la société englobante n'ont pas été transportées dans le domaine militaire, mais elles y ont été renforcées. La transmission des valeurs de la société civile à la société militaire ne devrait pas surprendre, étant donné la nature de cette dernière, agissant non pas comme une institution révolutionnaire mais comme une institution bien établie. Le renforcement joue favoriser le recrutement, le besoin de se conformer aux attitudes existantes dans la société et le besoin de compenser pour la violation de ces attitudes, accomplie du seul fait de l'admission des femmes au sein d'une institution masculine.

J'examinerai dans cette présentation la réflexion et le renforcement par la société militaire des attitudes sociales vis-à-vis de la sexualité chez les femmes dans deux domaines touchant la santé des femmes: soit le contrôle des maladies vénériennes dans le Corps féminin de l'Armée canadienne et le traitement des grossesses "illégitimes" dans le C.F.A.C.

With the exception of the Nursing Sisters of the Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps,(1) women were not admitted into the Armed Forces of Canada until World War II was well into its second year. At that time, efficient prosecution of
the war necessitated putting women into uniform and under service discipline. But the admission of women into the Army, Navy and Air Force, masculine institutions par excellence, severely challenged conventions respecting women's nature and the place of women in Canadian society. There was thus a tension inherent in the opening up of the Armed Services to women: the tension between the Canadian state's wartime need for female labour within those pre-eminently masculine institutions and Canadian society's longer-term commitment to a masculine-feminine dichotomy of traits and separation of tasks.

Recruitment propaganda, promotional newspaper stories and patriotic advertising reveal a deep ambivalence toward women joining the armed forces. On the one hand was the celebration of the trail blazing and achievement of women in the services and, on the other, the assurance that joining the forces changed nothing in women's nature and place in Canadian society. In 1943 the ambivalence intensified as more and more women were needed but recruitment met resistance and monthly enlistment figures dropped. The public opinion survey disclosed that few Canadians in the spring of 1943 gave high priority to enlistment in the armed forces as a way for women to contribute to the prosecution of the war. In answer to the question, "How can women best serve Canada's war effort?" only 7% replied, "by joining the women's forces." Five other categories of work took precedence in the mind of the Canadian public. "Maintaining home life" ranked first in importance for the highest proportion of Canadians (26%), followed second by...
"doing war work in factories" (23%),
third "part-time voluntary relief work" (13%),
fourth "conserving food, rationing" (11%) and fifth "buying war
bonds, stamps" (8%). (7) Since the
third, fourth and fifth categories,
that is, "part-time voluntary relief
work," "conserving food, rationing,"
and "buying war bonds, stamps" were all
compatible with "maintaining home
life," the inescapable conclusion is
that an overwhelming majority of Can­
adians in 1943 saw women's place to be
in the home, wartime or not.

Given the extent of that sentiment, it
is no wonder that those in charge of
recruitment for the three services saw
their task as essentially one of edu­
cating the public. In August 1943 the
Combined Services Committee observed
that "overcoming established tradition
and developing acceptance of a new
idea is obviously a long-term educa­
tional proposition" and defined as the
primary object of its campaign to re­
cruit women for the armed forces:
"overcoming the tradition that women's
place is exclusively in the home... or at least not in military uniform." (8)

In actual fact the armed forces were
"breaking down" the tradition that
women's place was in the home to only
a limited extent. They were not, for
instance, taking mothers of young
children away from their families.
Married women were eligible to join
the Canadian Women's Army Corps (9) but
mothers of dependent children (age 16
if male, 17 if female) were not. (10)

The armed services were, however,
taking unmarried daughters out of the
family circle. This was resisted in
part because the daughters' services
were needed to "maintain home life."
But more serious resistance was rooted
in the concern that out of the family
circle daughters would be away from
parental surveillance. The assumption
that daughters needed more surveillance
than sons, that is, were minors longer
than their brothers, was shared by
Army authorities. CWAC Regulations
defined dependency in children differ­
ently for male and female: sons ceased
being regarded as dependent after age
16, daughters after age 17. The as­
sumption that young women were less
adult than young men and in need,
therefore, of more protection underlay
Army policies affecting the despatch
of CWACs overseas: the age limit for
CWACs was 21, (11) for men in the Can­
adian Army (Active), 18. In the spring
and summer of 1945 Army headquarters
established a policy of limiting the
tour of overseas duty for CWAC person­
nel to two years because the Minister
(Colonel Ralston) and the Adjutant-
General (Major-General A.E. Walford)
felt strongly that "it is inadvisable
to have women serve too long away from
[their] homeland." (12) These and
other protective policies sprang in
large measure, I would argue, from
social attitudes towards female sexu­
ality and society's double standard of
sexual morality. If there was wide­
spread fear that women joining the
forces would result in their loss of femininity, a deeper fear/suspicion was that women in the forces might lose their respectability.

By 1943, women in the services were the object of a "whispering campaign" causing alarm among military authorities.(13) Those in charge of women's recruitment were gravely concerned that the ugly rumours were having an adverse effect on enlistment and morale. The 29 April 1943 progress report of the Combined Services Committee boldly observed that:

The need for recruits will not be met unless we beat down the negative factors at present retarding recruiting, the malicious rumours and gossip. . . .(14)

The Wartime Information Board collected several examples of these rumours, among them are the following:

I was thinking of renting my spare room when I was warned not to rent to a member of the CWAC because they all had syphilis. (Dec., '42, Westmount, Quebec)

Conditions in camps where girls are stationed are bad and men are allowed to mix with the girls. An Inspector of Camps said that in camps east of Winnipeg, when the lights were turned on, girls were not only on the bed but under the beds with soldiers and airmen. (Dec., '42, Winnipeg)(15)

Both the general public opinion survey and the specific CWAC survey of 1943 were designed in part to gauge the extent of the damage. The results were not comforting: suspicion existed in the public mind that joining the forces would embark a young woman on a life of promiscuity. According to the public opinion survey, a significant proportion of the parents and young men who disapproved of women joining the forces gave as their reason that "it was an unladylike occupation" in which the young woman "would lose" her "self-respect." ("Unladylike, lose self-respect" was the survey's code language for female sexual license, indicating the identification of ladylike behaviour (gentility) with female sexual decorum.) (16) The CWAC report stated straightforwardly that "the general public felt that young women avoided enrolling in the women's services because of the fear of association with women of poor moral standards." (17) Such a high proportion of French Canadian parents and young men objected to women's enlistment on moral grounds that, the Elliott-Haynes tabulators concluded, "their opinion unduly influenced the national totals." Still the highest proportion of English Canadian parents and young men objecting also gave "unladylike, lose self-respect" as their grounds for disapproval. (18) The Elliott-Haynes report also showed that, as between parents and young men, a higher proportion of the latter, that is of the brothers and boy friends of eligible
young women, "criticized service women on moral grounds."(19) From its analysis of the "Type of Advice CWAC Women Obtained From Their Relatives and Friends," the CWAC report concluded that "members of the men's forces and boy friends were the most antagonistic towards the women's forces,"(20) and linked that antagonism to the belief "that women in uniform are immoral." (21) In general, then, both reports concluded that whether in the case of the part of the country with the highest opposition to women's joining the forces--French Canada--or in the case of the sex and age group of the population with the highest opposition--young men, particularly servicemen--the opposition was related to the bad reputation attaching to servicewomen.

Within the terms of the prevailing moral climate, there was some basis in fact for what recruiting officers wanted to dismiss as "baseless gos­sip."(22) As early as December 1941 medical officers of all three services were meeting to discuss "the methods of handling and disposition of cases of venereal disease discovered in female personnel enrolled in the three services."(23) In the spring of 1942 pregnancy in unmarried servicewomen joined venereal infection as a serious problem of medical treatment, welfare and "wastage" of armed forces female personnel.(24) The two sources of the problem came to be treated like Siamese twins, their common link being promiscuity. For as opprobrium began to dog the heels of the servicewomen's sturdy Oxfords, the incidence of "il­legitimate" pregnancy and of VD became problems as much moral as medical. Indeed, in the late spring and summer of 1943, the office of the Director General of Medical Services was compiling alarming data on the relatively high incidence of "pregnancy among unmarried personnel of the CWAC" and of VD within the Corps at more or less the same time as the Directorate of Army Recruiting and the Combined Services Committee began seeing as one of their most important tasks the need to spike rumours which were giving servicewomen their bad name.(25)

Although the incidence of VD among male soldiers was higher than that among members of the CWAC, and although in one study servicemen made up 86.3% of the putative fathers named by CWACs discharged for "illegitimate" preg­nancy,(26) the male Army, by virtue of the double standard of sexual morality, was not made the object of a vicious "whispering campaign" to discredit it on moral grounds. It was almost ex­pected of men in the forces to have a fling: any consequent "illegitimate" pregnancies were unfortunate, but primarily the woman's responsibility; any consequent VD infection was socially undesirable and, when the rate got high, cause for alarm and a massive campaign to control its spread. But men did not
risk acquiring a bad reputation by joining the forces.

Even if one regarded unmarried pregnancy or contracting VD as evidence of promiscuity and therefore, by definition, of immorality, most of society undoubtedly did, only a small percentage of servicewomen were thus affected. Yet the rumour-mongers tarred the entire CWAC (and women's units of the Air Force and Navy) with the same brush. Imputing low moral character to servicewomen generally was an expression of the assumption that women who broke with convention in one way must have broken with convention in most other ways as well. According to this reasoning, if a woman defied tradition by donning a uniform and joining the forces, she had to be a loose woman. The possibility of such a suspicion explains in part the connection in tradition-bound French Canadian opinion between opposition to women joining the forces and the belief that women in uniform were immoral. It also explains in part why servicemen expressed their opposition in the form of jokes at the expense of the moral character of servicewomen. This point of view was taken by some observers at the time, such as one civilian member of the Combined Services Committee whose explanation for the "whispering campaign" was that "there has always been criticism of anything new and radically different" and in whose opinion "our rumour-mongers" belonged "in a witch-hunting category."(27)

But there were other contemporary explanations for why servicemen in particular so vehemently opposed the entrance of women into the services. The office of the Director of Army Recruiting commented:

Men friends dislike endorsing a career for a woman in uniform mainly because they feel it is another male job on which women have encroached.(28)

As an expression of opposition to women's admission into the military, servicemen's part in the spreading of lewd stories about servicewomen bears comparison with the reaction of some male medical students and lecturers in the 1880s to women's admission to medical school.(29) Servicemen's salacious jibes at servicewomen also had an aspect of dodging guilt by blaming and slandering the victim, since in the overwhelming majority of cases servicemen were the fathers of the "illegitimate" children with whom unmarried servicewomen were pregnant and the lovers of the servicewomen who became infected with VD.

It is clear from the counteraction they took that the top brass at National Defence Headquarters (NDHQ) were convinced that male other ranks (and also lower-ranking officers and Non-Commissioned Officers) were guilty of spreading ugly rumours about servicewomen. Assurance was given at a
meeting of the Combined Services Committee on 9 June 1943 that "a directive was going forward from Ottawa to Commanding Officers at all Stations advising them to inform . . . their Officers and Men that any word or action on their part that might be found to reflect upon the character of girls in uniform will be punishable." (30) The Adjutant General's actual circular letter (31 May 1943) warned that officers and other ranks who "discouraged prospective recruits to the Women's Services of the Armed Forces by circulating stories which have no foundation in fact" were guilty of "directly violating Regulation 39 of the Defence of Canada Regulations." It further directed District Officers Commanding to "take immediate steps to curb this tendency and to take drastic action against such offenders under their Command." (31) There is strong evidence that the counter-action of the high command was ineffective and that the rumours continued. The Adjutant-General felt constrained to issue another circular letter a year later. In steeply escalated rhetoric, it spoke of the continuation of "insinuating rumours against members of the CWAC," and the necessity to make "every effort . . . to counteract this malicious slander." Officers Commanding were instructed:

... to investigate any derogatory reports and to stamp these out at the source, rather than that they should be allowed to spread and become distorted and exaggerated.

It ended with the order that "an all out effort be made to stamp out these false rumours." (32)

The rumours were a matter of grave concern to high Army Officers because of their adverse effect on women's recruitment and morale within the Corps. Because the CWAC survey had revealed that a large percentage of the CWACs had been informed and positively influenced about the Corps by women already in the forces (32% of those responding to the question "How did you first learn of the CWAC?"), (33) the Director of Army Recruiting had concluded that this, "the only goodwill group," should be more fully exploited. (34) One means hit upon was for CWAC women to write letters to their civilian girl friends. Set in motion in the summer of 1944, this so-called "in-service recruiting drive" was not terribly successful, (35) indeed at times it actually backfired. In August 1944 the District Recruiting Officer of M.D. No. 13 (Calgary, Alberta) forwarded to the Directorate of Army Recruiting, Ottawa, a venomous reply to such an "in-service recruiting letter." As if in response to a deep insult the correspondent had angrily written:

I resent your bringing into the subject of me joining up, my brothers. Have you ever heard a serviceman speak well of the W.D.'s, Army, Air Force, or Navy? Nine out of every ten resent having
girls in uniform and my brothers, Sterling included, said they would disown me if I ever join with such scruff. (36)

A CWAC Officer at the Directorate of Army Recruiting (Lieutenant Colonel Mary Dover) ruled that the angry reply should be preserved to "be included in the history of recruiting, to show how difficult their job has often been." The letter also serves to document the connection between the bad-mouthing of women in uniform by servicemen and their resentment of women encroaching on a formerly male preserve.

In the fight against the "whispering campaign," Army authorities publicly spoke of the rumours' groundlessness, falsity or at least distortion and exaggeration. Not to add fuel to the fire, Defence Headquarters Officials in their attempts to explain the rumour-mongering passed over the verifiable evidence of VD infection and "illegitimate" pregnancy among servicewomen. Military authorities could not, of course, deny to themselves the hard evidence for what appeared to most of them to be the fall of some CWACs into promiscuity. And in their secret deliberations they sought explanations and possible remedies. These reveal class as well as sexual bias and dominant conceptions of femininity. (37)

For many CWAC officers the explanation was to be found in the policy of "mass recruiting" and the consequent "influx of undesirable types" into the CWAC. (38) According to this interpretation, the Director of Army Recruiting, faced with increasing demands for CWAC personnel "to release soldiers for the defence of Britain," inaugurated a policy of "wholesale enlistment" in the summer of 1942. Earlier in April 1942 the age limit for other ranks had been broadened from 21-40 to 18-45. The wholesale recruiting meant throwing open the doors to women without civilian trades training and with poor education and low intelligence. The fruits of the "indiscriminate enlistments," apparent by the spring of 1943, were lowered morale in the CWAC, an increasing number of discharges and a bad name for the Corps. CWAC officers, all university graduates or with equivalent "training and qualifications," equated unskilled and poorly educated women and those low in intelligence with "bad type" and blamed these "lower-grade women" for the problems of "discipline, unhappiness, discharges and ugly rumours" plaguing the Corps. In Captain Ruth Crealock's estimation, "if this number of lower-grade women can be decreased, many of our present problems will automatically disappear." Male Army officers were also given to explaining high rates of VD infection or "illegitimate" pregnancy in terms of the "quality of recruits" having been "sacrificed in the interests of quantity." (39) Although the results of
some studies purported to show that there was a correlation between low level of skill, education and intelligence and high incidence of VD and "illegitimate" pregnancy, they could hardly be adduced as incontrovertible evidence. Furthermore, there was evidence which pointed away from that conclusion. As early as July 1943, authorities at Defence Headquarters began discussing introduction of a policy of "selective recruiting," by which was meant "discrimination at the recruitment level between low calibre, poor character women and women [who] have good character, trades experience or trainable qualities." When it was introduced in February 1944 its stated aim was to restrict acceptability for enlistment to "tradeswomen or potential tradeswomen." In practice a quota was established which "demanded that 67% of enlisted personnel be tradeswomen material" (by August the quota had dropped to 62% and by November to 55%).

Meanwhile another kind of screening had been introduced, that of carefully examining all potential recruits for pregnancy. A study of 95 women discharged from the CWAC for "illegitimate" pregnancy between 1 January and 31 May 1943 had disclosed that 31.5% of them had been pregnant before enlistment. After 1 June that percentage was reduced, presumably because medical boards were checking for pregnancy more carefully. "The exclusion of women pregnant before enlistment," however, did "not appear to have lowered the incidence of illegitimate pregnancy." Calculated at 32.1 per thousand unmarried women in the CWAC per year on the basis of figures for 1 January 1943 through 30 April 1943, it had risen to 33 per thousand per annum based on the figures for April, May, June and July. Nor did the "selective recruiting" introduced in February have a reducing effect. At the end of 1944 it was reported that "the incidence of illegitimate pregnancies has remained consistent at approximately 35 per thousand strength per annum" for the past two years.

Meanwhile when the incidence of VD in the CWAC was reduced in the last three quarters of 1944 "to half its former figure," the lowering was not credited to a higher calibre of recent recruit but rather to "the campaign of education undertaken by the Venereal Disease Control Section." The assumption that "an influx of bad types" explained the "excessively high" rates of VD and "illegitimate" pregnancy in the CWAC was clearly rooted in class bias but is also an example of the survival into World War II of the sexual double standard's division of women into two rigidly separated categories, the pure and the impure, the virgin and the whore. By that dichotomization if a CWAC was pregnant out of wedlock or infected with VD,
she was ipso facto a "bad type."
Blaming high rates of VD and pregnancy among unmarried CWACs on a superfluity of "lower-grade women" in the Corps was also clearly rooted in class bias. With the "selective recruiting policy appealing for enlistment of skilled and well-educated women,"(48) the Army hoped to attract a higher grade of woman. "University women" were regarded as "generally of a superior type—in many instances belonging to prominent families. . ."(49) Ads began to speak of the CWAC's urgent need for university graduates. (50)
Another way in which Army officers explained to themselves the CWAC's high rate of VD and "illegitimate" pregnancy involved conceding one of the grounds objectors gave for disapproving of women in the armed forces: that the life was unsuitable for women. According to this explanation, the incompatibility of the masculine armed forces with femininity lowered the morale of servicewomen and in that state of low morale they entered into liaisons which risked their respectability. In this explanation as developed by the Director of Army Recruiting (DAR), women's exclusion (exemption) from combat was crucial:

The Army is a male society developed by men over centuries around the role of the fighting soldier. This society is traditional and imposes rigid discipline and harsh living conditions on the individual in order to build up and maintain the type of physical and mental fitness required for effective action in the field. Upon entering the Army the modern civilian male soon learns to subordinate his own personality to his new role in the Army, for, he finds out, his life will eventually depend upon it. He becomes a soldier first and an individual second.(51)

Women, the DAR continued, had been incorporated into modern armies, but in the Canadian Army, exclusively to perform non-combatant jobs. Women of the CWAC "do not and are not expected to fight." Canadian society had made "this restriction in role" for "a good reason": because it recognized "that women are physiologically and temperamentally different from men—they are feminine." He then went on to list what he considered to be the four basic characteristics of femininity. (And only with the second did he grant it was a matter of nurture rather than nature.)

1) Women "do not possess the same strength and endurance."
2) Canadian society had "encouraged them to have more delicate feelings, more spiritual values and more romantic attitudes."
3) "Their natural role is in marriage and that of a home maker."

The fourth was a concomitant of the third: the temporariness of "their role in business and industry," a job in the paid labour force being only
"a preliminary step to marriage."
The DAR's further argument was that, aside from excluding (exempting) women from combat, the Army had not otherwise taken these characteristics of femininity into consideration. Instead it had indiscriminately applied masculine standards, had imposed "the traditional Army system," to no good purpose since servicewomen were not needed as fighting soldiers. Hence the DAR proposed a new approach, not just to recruitment but to treatment of women in the services in general: that life for members of the CWAC, "both on the job and in the barracks, be approached completely and totally from the point-of-view that women are different." Since they had resisted becoming soldiers first and individuals second, let them "remain women first and soldiers second."

Underpinning the DAR's remarks lay an assumption which others shared: that regimentation in the sense of the enforced anonymity and uniformity of military life was antithetical to femininity and womanliness. Doing her bit once again to dispel the public's fears that army life was harmful to women, journalist Lotta Dempsey wrote in her feature article for the third of Mayfair's special 1943 supplements on "Women at War:"

Even the younger soldiers who have no traditions of man-only wars are astonished at the adaptability of girls to precision drill and physical training.

Her next sentence went on to register astonishment that feminine individuality was not obliterated by military regimentation, only temporarily submerged:

[Women's] ability to weld into a composite for training and disciplinarian purposes, and to emerge as definitely distinctive as only women can be, has been a discovery as significant in its way as any of the scientific facts of wartime research.(52)

Whether in Dempsey's rosy picture for public consumption or in the secret deliberations within the Directorate of Army Recruiting, the assumption remained the same: the femininity of a platoon of servicewomen lay not in their ability to perform a faultless march past or close order drill but in their "distinctiveness," "their personal freedom and individuality."

Although those ringing words call to mind lofty proclamations of inalienable rights of man, neither Dempsey nor the recruiting officers had anything so lofty in mind. When the DAR suggested that such slogans as "a man is doing your job" or "there are jobs for women in the Army" would "put across the individuality of [the] contribution which women can make," all he really meant by "individuality" was femininity in the sense of a job being done appropriately by a woman in contrast to inappropriately by a man. (53) And indeed similar slogans were used in the campaign to present ser-
vice in the CWAC as not masculinizing. Most often women's individuality was equated with creating the realm of the personal, the homey: the little "feminine touches" that brighten up a room, such as curtains on windows, flowers in a vase. On close examination what women's alleged penchant for personal freedom turns out to have meant is nothing more than self-expression through choice of clothes and style of external appearance.

So as a means of raising morale and lowering the "illegitimate" pregnancy and VD rates, Brigadier Chisholm, Director General of Medical Services, stressed the importance not only of developing and increasing recreational facilities and organized sports but the "desirability of introducing the minor appurtenances women usually surround themselves with" into service-women's living quarters and recreation rooms. As at the time these rooms were being maintained as "regimental Barracks," women were seeking "an outlet for their feminine characteristics elsewhere."(54) Other Medical Corps officers made similar recommendations. In order to raise the morale of the CWAC, one wrote,

... the question of curtains and book shelves and such like and cupboards for personal belongings in C.W.A.C. barracks should be thoroughly considered.(55)

It was recommended that the recreation rooms "be furnished in a home-like manner," that single beds be substituted for double decker bunks in barrack rooms "to produce a more home-like atmosphere." It was also urged that CWAC personnel required more "privacy" than Army men, especially in the rooms containing bathing and toilet facilities.

Some of these recommendations were implemented. A 1944 recruiting booklet pictured curtains on the windows of CWAC sleeping quarters, spoke of "barracks partitioned into cubicles," four "girls" to a cubicle, and promised "mirrors and bureaux" and "attractive recreation rooms."(56) Still the CWAC District Officers at their February 1945 conference felt the deregimentation had not proceeded far enough and therefore recommended that: "regimentation of CWAC personnel be considered from all aspects in an endeavour to reduce same wherever feasible."(57) And in August 1946, just before the dissolution of the CWAC, the then Senior Staff Officer, CWAC, in her report on the Corps and recommendations for the future should such a women's service be formed again, pointed out areas where deregimentation had fallen short. Showers and baths had not been partitioned. The partitioning of sleeping quarters was incomplete: the partitions had not reached from floor to ceiling nor been provided with doors. Greater "latitude in decoration of sleeping quarters" should have
been allowed: "the provision of bed-spreads as well as the curtains, already on issue, would do much to create a pleasant, homelike atmosphere." Also in the future all Mess Halls used by servicewomen should be "bright" and "attractive" and furnished with "chairs rather than benches to sit on," for "women especially need a homey atmosphere in their dining hall."(58)

Throughout the discussion an identification was made between women and the private sphere: home and the comforts of home. The armed forces had wrenched women out of that feminine realm and plunged them into an implacably masculine one: no wonder some of them had broken down.

Despite the doubts expressed among themselves, however, recruiting and promotion officers worked hard to dispel from the public mind any notion of immorality tainting women in uniform. In enlistment appeals emphasis was put on the high calibre of women drawn to the Canadian Women's Army Corps. "The C.W.A.C. . . . A Cross Section of Canada's Finest Womanhood" proclaimed the CWAC recruiting pamphlet from the second half of 1943. It went on to assure prospective recruits that the "standards of conduct" of CWAC women were no different from:

... those of representative Canadian women, for putting on a uniform does not change them, except
insofar as they are imbued with pride in that uniform and would not do anything to bring it into disrepute. (59)

When a CWAC in uniform did do something to discredit the Corps, immediate action was taken. Reports of unmarried CWACs en route to Depot Companies for discharge who had been seen traveling in uniform in advanced stages of pregnancy (and in one case, with a baby in arms) reached Defence Headquarters in February 1944. As soon as the military machinery could be set in motion, it was arranged for servicewomen in such condition to travel in civilian clothes. (60)

Despite such occurrences the Army sought to persuade the public that the "girls" in uniform were well looked after. The Officer Commanding a CWAC unit was to be thought of as "trying to take the place of [a girl's] parents." (61) The public was told that service policewomen were "uniformed guardians of the morals and manners of the Women's Army and Air Force," their job "to play big sister to girls in uniform." (62)

Another tack taken in advertising the propriety of the Corps was to stress parental pride in a daughter "joining up." "I'm proud of you, Daughter" was scrawled in large writing across the top of one ad for the Canadian Women's Army Corps. Below appeared the drawing of a father with his arm around a sweet-faced and smiling young woman in uniform. (63) MAKE YOUR FAMILY PROUD!" urged the heading of another ad which in smaller print carried the coaxing message:

If you have any least thought that Dad or Mother might even silently hesitate to approve your becoming a member of the C.W.A.C.--banish that thought by looking ahead to the day when they will see you in your first "March Past." Then they will nudge each other. "There goes our girl" they will want to tell by-standers. Their hearts will leap with approval of your decision--their eyes will sparkle with joy and pride. (64)

The Combined Services Committee realized that one of the most effective means to combat the "whispering campaign" would be to get endorsement of the women's services from the eminently respectable National Council of Women. One member of the Committee wrote in June 1943:

... if we can ever reach a stage where the women's organizations look upon the Women's Forces as one of their particular war jobs, I think we will do a great deal to break down the rumour situation, which is now a serious problem. His aim was "to establish a sort of parental feeling amongst the women's groups for the women in the Armed Forces" for the reason that while "any woman reserves the right to criticize
her own children" she "will cut the heart out of anyone else who undertakes to criticize them."(65) Actually the Minister of National Defence and representatives of the Navy and Air Force had been writing the President of the National Council of Women since early May (1943) seeking her organization's support of the drive to recruit women for the armed forces.(66) At its 50th annual meeting (16-18 June 1943) it passed a resolution stating:

The National Council of Women of Canada desires to express admiration for, and confidence in the women of all ranks in the Women's Divisions of the Armed Services of Canada, and will support in every way the further recruiting of women for all branches of the services. But at the end of July the Department of National Defence was still seeking public endorsement by the National Council of Women for the drive to enlist women in the armed services.(67) The patience of the authorities at Defence Headquarters was finally rewarded on 30 July 1943 with the public statement of "The Stand of the National Council of Women of Canada on Recruiting of Women for the Armed Forces," by Mrs. Edgar D. Hardy, President. "In encouraging women of military age to enlist," Mrs. Hardy said of the thousands of respectable women her organization represented, "we are not asking the mothers of Canada to do any more than we are doing ourselves" as "many of . . . our daughters . . . have given up good positions and substantial pay checks" to join the forces "because loyalty to their country means more to them than easy living." Mrs. Hardy then put herself on the line. Mentioning that she had made it her own "particular job to investigate in detail the supervision given to the women of the Armed Forces," she went on to declare herself to be:

. . . in a position to assure Canadian mothers that their daughters joining the forces will receive a supervision, physical, mental and moral equal in every way to that which they had in civilian life.

The Combined Services Committee could not have asked for any firmer endorsement. Released to the press on August 16th, even it, as we have seen, was not enough to scotch the ugly rumours and salacious jibes.

. . . . . . . .

Caught between a patriotic willingness to make an all-out effort to win the war and a conservative unwillingness to change society's relegation of women to home and family (or temporary and lowly places in the paid labour force), Canadian society responded with ambivalence to the admission of women into the armed forces during World War II. That ambivalence was complicated by class and sex and ethnicity. But Canadian society's ambivalent response was not just a function of some die-hard opposition on one side, whether from resentful servicemen or from traditionalist French Canadians, and whole-
hearted support on the other, as from the women of the volunteer service corps. Ambivalence characterized the response of many who were basically quite in favour of having women in uniform, at least for the duration of the war, such as the servicewomen themselves, both officers and other ranks, female journalists bent on promoting women's enlistment and recruitment and public relations officers. In either case, whether that of adamant disapproval versus eager support, or in the more common case of fundamental support qualified by reservations, the divided feeling was rooted in two fears: a fear of loss of femininity and a fear of loss of respectability. While some Canadians were convinced that the woman who joined the services was condemned to mannishness or whoredom and others argued that a woman's femininity and sexual virtue could survive enlistment, no one took the position that concern over loss of femininity and respectability was absurd. The ambivalent response of Canadian society to women's admission to the armed forces indicates a widespread consensus during World War II on what the respectable woman should be: above all attractive and submissive to men and hence marriageable but at the same time sexually chaste, that is, sufficiently, self-controlled (or repressed) to limit sexuality to the confines of marriage and motherhood. Perhaps because the combatant role always lurked in the background as a threatening possibility for women in uniform, the reaction to women's admission to the armed forces was at its most Victorian.

APPENDIX A

Objections to Female Friends and Relatives Joining Armed Forces

French parents, husbands and boy friends were so deeply prejudiced against working and service women on moral grounds that their opinion unduly influenced the national totals. English parents, husbands and boy friends did not want their daughters, wives, sisters and girl friends to join the armed forces as much because they felt women were not needed as that the service was morally degrading. Their objections to women taking war jobs were generalized. (See Table on following page.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL CANADA OBJECTIONS TO FEMALE FRIENDS AND RELATIVES</th>
<th>Joining Forces</th>
<th>Taking War Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total parents and young men interviewed</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNLADYLIKE, LOSE SELF-RESPECT</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not needed</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not suited, hard life</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home obligations</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion disapproving</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH-CANADIAN OBJECTIONS TO FEMALE FRIENDS AND RELATIVES</th>
<th>Joining Forces</th>
<th>Taking War Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total parents and young men interviewed</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNLADYLIKE, LOSE SELF-RESPECT</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not needed</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not suited, hard life</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home obligations</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion disapproving</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elliott-Haynes, p. 22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRENCH CANADIAN OBJECTIONS TO FEMALE FRIENDS AND RELATIVES</th>
<th>Joining Forces</th>
<th>Taking War Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total parents and young men interviewed</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNLADYLIKE, LOSE SELF-RESPECT</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not needed</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not suited, hard life</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home obligations</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion disapproving</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Young men criticized service women on moral grounds more than parents did. (Total Canada 21%, Parents 19%, Young Men 27%).

Elliott-Haynes, p. 23.
APPENDIX B

Reasons General Public Gave as to Why Women Do Not Enroll

The general public felt that young women avoided enrolling in the women's services because of fear of association with women of poor moral standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Total Public</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Young Men</th>
<th>Young Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor moral standards</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No civilian comforts</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking discipline</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproval of family, friends</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrack life, no privacy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not war conscious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically unfit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack knowledge of services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor pay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress regulations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CWAC Report, p. 27
APPENDIX C

Type of Advice CWAC Women Obtained From Their Relatives and Friends

Members of the men's armed forces and boy friends were the most antagonistic towards the women's forces. Women friends already in the forces were the only people which gave outspoken approval and encouragement. From the combined totals below it would appear that even women now in the CWAC received about as much discouragement as encouragement from their friends and relatives to their idea of joining up.

Type of Advice Given

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Total Advising</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unfavourable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Forces</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In forces</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In forces</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All combined</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CWAC Report, p. 28.
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